

# DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 097 533

CE 002 304

AUTHOR Dachler, H. Peter  
TITLE Work Motivation and the Concept of Organizational Climate. Research Report No. 4.  
INSTITUTION Maryland Univ., College Park. Dept. of Psychology.  
SPONS AGENCY Office of Naval Research, Washington, D.C. Personnel and Training Research Programs Office.  
PUB DATE May 74  
NOTE 20p.; For related documents, see CE 002 299-303  
EDRS PRICE MF-\$0.75 HC-\$1.50 PLUS POSTAGE  
DESCRIPTORS \*Behavior; Concept Formation; Individual Characteristics; \*Interaction; Literature Reviews; \*Motivation; \*Organizational Climate; Organizational Theories; Relationship; \*Work Attitudes; Work Environment  
IDENTIFIERS Organizational Behavior

## ABSTRACT

Although the hypothesis that behavior is a function of the person in interaction with his environment is a very old one, an overview of current theory and research on work motivation and job satisfaction reveals an emphasis on either one or the other sets of variables, at the expense of investigating systematically the interaction between personal and environmental variables. The literature on the concept of organizational climate and its relationship to organizational behavior is briefly reviewed in an attempt to find a framework within which the interaction hypothesis can be systematically investigated. The lack of specific conceptualization concerning organization climate and the multitude of noncomparable operational definitions of organizational climate is noted. The paper argues that this state of affairs makes the climate concept untractable and greatly distracts from the potential that this concept has for clarifying the study of the interaction hypothesis. It is suggested that the relatively explicitly stated expectancy models of motivation might not only help to provide conceptual clarity to the concept of organizational climate, but might also provide a framework within which the person-environment interaction hypothesis can be investigated. Such an approach should also increase our understanding of the work motivation process.  
(Author)

**BEST COPY AVAILABLE**

**WORK MOTIVATION AND THE CONCEPT OF ORGANIZATIONAL CLIMATE**

**H. PETER DACHLER**

**Research Report No. 4**

**May, 1974**

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH  
EDUCATION & WELFARE  
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF  
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

The preparation of this report was supported in part by the Personnel and Training Research Programs, Psychological Sciences Division, Office of Naval Research under Contract No. N00014-67-A-0239-0025, Contract Authority Identification Number, NR 151-350, Benjamin Schneider and H. Peter Dachler, Principal Investigators.

Reproduction in whole or part is permitted for any purpose of the United States Government. Approved for public release; distribution unlimited.

psychology



UNCLASSIFIED

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE (When Data Entered)

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE		READ INSTRUCTIONS BEFORE COMPLETING FORM
1. REPORT NUMBER Research Report No. 4	2. GOVT ACCESSION NO.	3. RECIPIENT'S CATALOG NUMBER
4. TITLE (and Subtitle)  Work Motivation and the Concept of Organizational Climate		5. TYPE OF REPORT & PERIOD COVERED Interim Technical Report
		6. PERFORMING ORG. REPORT NUMBER
7. AUTHOR(s) H. Peter Dachler		8. CONTRACT OR GRANT NUMBER(s) N00014-67-A-0239-0025
9. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME AND ADDRESS Department of Psychology University of Maryland College Park, Maryland 20742		10. PROGRAM ELEMENT, PROJECT, TASK AREA & WORK UNIT NUMBERS 61153N; RR 042-04; RR 042-04-02; NR 151-350
11. CONTROLLING OFFICE NAME AND ADDRESS Personnel and Training Research Programs Office of Naval Research (Code 458) Arlington, Virginia 22217		12. REPORT DATE May, 1974
		13. NUMBER OF PAGES 12
14. MONITORING AGENCY NAME & ADDRESS (if different from Controlling Office)		15. SECURITY CLASS. (of this report) Unclassified
		15a. DECLASSIFICATION/DOWNGRADING SCHEDULE
16. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of this Report)  Approved for public release; distribution unlimited		
17. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abstract entered in Block 20, if different from Report)		
18. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES Presented for an invited workshop, 10th Annual Conference of the Eastern Academy of Management		
19. KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number)  Organizational climate, Expectancy-instrumentality theory, Construct validation, Person-environment interaction		
20. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number) Although the hypothesis that behavior is a function of the person in interaction with his environment is a very old one, an overview of current theory and research on work motivation and job satisfaction reveals an emphasis on either one or the other sets of variables, at the expense of investigating systematically the interaction between personal and environmental variables.  The literature on the concept of organizational climate and its relation- ship to organizational behavior is briefly reviewed in an attempt to find a		

DD FORM 1473  
1 JAN 73EDITION OF 1 NOV 65 IS OBSOLETE  
S/N 0102-014-6601

UNCLASSIFIED

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE (When Data Entered)

UNCLASSIFIED

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE(When Data Entered)

framework within which the interaction hypothesis can be systematically investigated.

The lack of specific conceptualization concerning organization climate and the multitude of non-comparable operational definitions of organizational climate is noted. The paper argues that this state of affairs makes the climate concept untractable and greatly distracts from the potential that this concept has for clarifying the study of the interaction hypothesis.

It is suggested that the relatively explicitly stated expectancy models of motivation might not only help to provide conceptual clarity to the concept of organizational climate, but might also provide a framework within which the person-environment interaction hypothesis can be investigated. Such an approach should also increase our understanding of the work motivation process.

UNCLASSIFIED

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE(When Data Entered)

# WORK MOTIVATION AND THE CONCEPT OF ORGANIZATIONAL CLIMATE<sup>1</sup>

H. Peter Dachler

University of Maryland

There is an old hypothesis, popularized by Lewin (1938), and now so widely accepted as to be a truism, which states that behavior is a function of the person in interaction with his environment. Yet in looking over the research efforts concerning behavior in organizations, one is amazed by a fairly distinct separation between researchers who seek understanding of organizational behavior by focusing upon person characteristics and those who focus upon the characteristics of the environment. Although there is certainly a lot to learn about the effects of individual attributes on behavior in organizations, and granting that peoples' environments (whether it be the organizational environment or a person's larger life space) contain numerous perplexing attributes whose effects on behavior we would like to understand, one could with rightful indignation ask: "where has all the interaction gone?". Within the domain of theories of organizations, Lichtman & Hunt (1971) have presented very convincing arguments that the most useful research approaches to the understanding of organizations are those which are based on the assumption that behavior in organizations is the outcome of the interaction of personalistic and structural variables. This paper will discuss the implications of the interaction point of view for work motivation, organizational climate and related research.

---

<sup>1</sup> Paper presented for an invited workshop: theory and research in work motivation: current and future trends, 10th Annual Conference of the Eastern Academy of Management, Philadelphia, 1973.

The comments, suggestions, and often "uncomfortable" questions raised by Ben Schneider are gratefully acknowledged.

Although most of the theories of work motivation have incorporated the hypothesis that motivated behavior is a function of personal psychological entities (motives, needs, values, beliefs, personal goals, interests, drives, habits) as well as environmental properties (incentives, work outcomes schedules of reinforcements, goal difficulty, task characteristics, supervisor characteristics, organizational characteristics), research on work motivation and job satisfaction has too often concentrated on either one or the other sets of variables. Thus, job enrichment, job enlargement, power equalization, and management by objectives approaches to employee motivation, for example, have too often relied on assessing and manipulating various dimensions in the organization members' work environment, assuming that certain motive or need states and personality characteristics exist universally and that these personal psychological states have a bearing on the environmental characteristics which are being assessed or manipulated. The tenuousness of these assumptions have already been documented among others by Strauss (1963), Hulin and Blood (1968) and Hulin (1971). Furthermore, by concentrating on assessment and manipulation of environmental variables which are assumed to interact with various personal psychological states, without systematically looking at the interaction of the two sets of variables, we are destined to continue having only a vague and oversimplified scientific definition of the concept of work motivation.

Just like some researchers interested in work motivation seem to emphasize environmental characteristics at the expense of the personalistic variables, there are too many motivation researchers who focus nearly exclusively on personalistic variables, without including into their research strategies ways of assessing and understanding the interaction of their personalistic variables with specific environmental dimensions in producing certain behavioral outcomes. For example, one of the currently most popular motivation theories, Valence-Instrumentality-Expectancy (VIE) theory (Campbell, Dunnette, Lawler & Weick,

1970; Dachler & Mobley, 1973; Lawler, 1971; Mitchell & Biglan, 1971; Porter & Lawler, 1968; Vroom, 1964), has been tested nearly exclusively by assessing personal beliefs, values, and anticipated satisfactions. This research emphasis has occurred even though VIE theory has explicitly assumed that perceptions of Expectancy and Instrumentality as well as anticipated satisfaction are a consequence of the interaction between, on the one hand, existing and experienced environmental conditions and events (Dachler & Mobley, 1973); Graen, 1969; Vroom, 1964) and, on the other hand, personal characteristics such as peoples' values and needs (Vroom, 1964), their self-esteem (Lawler, 1971) and perceived ability and skills (Dachler & Mobley, 1973), as well as personality traits like Internal-External Control of Reinforcement (Lawler, 1971) and maximizing versus satisfying decision strategies (March & Simon, 1958). There exists only a very few studies (e.g. Graen, 1969) which explicitly attempted to assess the degree to which manipulated environmental conditions were related to the perceptions of instrumentality and expectancy.

In this connection it should be remembered that it is not always clear what is implied by the term interaction between personal and environmental characteristics. In some instances, interaction is used in the Analysis of Variance sense. Thus a given amount of some value or need makes relevant certain environmental dimensions but not others, in producing certain emotional or attitudinal reactions (Locke, 1969). On the other hand, Graen's (1969) study and his concept of boundary conditions implies both a main effect as well as a moderating effect of certain environmental conditions and events on perceptions of instrumentality and expectancy and their relation to overt behavior. In the present paper the term interaction is used to imply both the traditional meaning in the Analysis of Variance sense as well as the idea that environmental conditions and events may be a direct influence on certain personal psychological states which in turn have a bearing on overt behavior.



In summary, our ability to explicitly define the meaning of the construct of work motivation has been impaired by researchers emphasis on the main effects of personal and environmental characteristics at the expense of systematically investigating the interactions and interdependence of these two sets of variables (Schein, 1965).

In an extensive construct validation study of VIE theory in two organizations Dachler and Mobley (1973) found that the VIE theory predictions were consistently supported in the organization which appeared to provide conditions that allowed for accurate perceptions about the consequences of alternative performance levels and about the likelihood of engaging in the various alternative performance levels. The VIE hypotheses were not consistently supported in the organization which appeared to provide conditions which hindered accurate perceptions about the consequences of alternative behaviors and expectancies concerning those behaviors. Although this study, unfortunately, did not include any direct measures of these organizational conditions, personal observations of and experiences with the environmental conditions in the two organizations provided some clues which tended to support the conclusion that a wide variety of organizational characteristics may serve as environmental constraints, limiting motivation for certain levels of performance and serving as conditions which either impede the accuracy or realism of employee perceptions and conclusions, or which generally make it difficult to "rationally" choose among various behavioral alternatives all of which have equally likely desirable or undesirable consequences.

These conclusions point to the importance of incorporating into VIE theory of motivation the effects of both actual environmental conditions as well as individual's perceptions of these environmental conditions, in order to more adequately define the construct of motivation (Miner & Dachler, 1973).



In the search for a systematic approach to assessing those organizational conditions which may have relevance for clarifying the psychological meaning of the still ambiguous VIE definition of work motivation the concept of organizational climate (Forehand, 1968; Forehand & Gilmer, 1964; Litwin & Stringer, 1968; Schneider & Bartlett, 1968; Tagiuri, 1968) appeared to provide a good starting point. Although there seems to be as many definitions of this concept as there are researchers writing about organizational climate, the central idea underlying the climate variable concerns the invariant, relatively enduring quality of the internal organizational environment which is molar rather than molecular, which according to some authors (e.g. Forehand & Gilmer, 1964) exists outside of the actor and according to most authors (e.g. Schneider, 1973) exists as perceptions organization members have of the organization, and which has potential behavioral consequences. These central themes which seem to underly the writings of climate researchers are obviously relevant to the problem of assessing the interaction between the environment, as well as the perceptions of it, with the motivational variables of VIE theory. Unfortunately, however, the literature on organizational climate reveals a paucity of systematic conceptualization concerning the attributes and thus the psychological meaning of the climate term. As Cronbach and Meehl (1955) put it "...to make clear what something is means to set forth the laws in which it occurs (p. 290)." Time constraints do not allow a review of the climate literature and therefore a documentation of what Guion (1973) refers to as "the fuzziest concept to come along in some time." But some general comments regarding the state of climate research need to be made in order to illustrate the importance of explicit conceptualization.

As is true in the development of any psychological construct, we start with some vague assumptions about the properties of a construct which are based upon our own hunches, on what we generally know or believe to be true, and what seems to be suggested by the relevant literature (Hyman, 1964). This is essentially what some of the early researchers on organizational climate have done (Lewin, 1951; Lewin, Lippitt & White, 1939; Litwin & Stringer, 1968; Schneider & Bartlett, 1968; Tagiuri & Litwin, 1968). For example, Lewin (1951) talks about the "atmosphere" of the field and places that concept as a functional link between the person and the environment, thus separating the concept of atmosphere or climate from the actual environment "out there". Tagiuri (1968) discusses various basic problems with environmental concepts. His list includes:

- (a) distinguishing between the objective and subjective environment
- (b) distinguishing between the person and the situation
- (c) determining what aspects of the environment need to be specified
- (d) identifying the structures and dynamics of the environment

All of these questions clearly have to be resolved in any conceptualization of climate and have to therefore be reflected in the operational definitions of the climate variable. However, Tagiuri (1968) in his conclusion states that "it is possible to approach the problem [of climate] systematically and empirically through somewhat arbitrary operational definitions". It seems that researchers of climate have too often taken Tagiuri's advice too literally. Thus many climate studies have concentrated on taxonomies of the environment or climate factors which have yielded a truly amazing number of different sets of dimensions (see Campbell, Dunnette, Lawler & Weick, 1970) which vary not only in numbers of dimensions but in the psychological entities that they refer to or seem relevant to. A comparison of the operational definitions of climate which underly the various dimensions uncovered by these studies makes it impossible to decide whether climate is a satisfaction construct, a motivational

construct, a perceptual phenomenon, or an index of the actual environment (see Guion, 1973). One cannot help get the feeling from these studies that climate is truly a construct embracing all of organizational psychology. It seems a nearly impossible task, and a task with little likelihood of providing useful psychological insights, to measure or classify every conceivable aspect of the environment, especially if one is not clear whether one is assessing the perceptions of the environment which employees have or the actual properties of the environment. Schneider (1973) correctly argues that we have to ask the question "climate for what?". In other words, there has to be some criterion which specifies what aspects of this amorphous entity "climate" need to be assessed, a question which Tagiuri (1968) and others have raised some time ago.

A number of researchers have looked at the relationships between what they have operationally defined as climate and organizational behavior (e.g. Friedlander & Greenberg, 1971; Pritchard & Karasick, 1973) or the extent to which climate moderates the relationship between personal variables and performance (e.g. Frederiksen, 1966; Andrews, 1967). However, although some of the findings are very interesting and hint at exciting and potentially crucial properties of the concept of climate, the operational definitions are often so arbitrary [to use Tagiuri's (1968) term] and the hypotheses which are being tested are often so devoid of any systematic tie to an explicitly stated theoretical foundation, that one finds it difficult to obtain much of a sense of research convergence on the psychological meaning of the concept of climate. If climate means many different things, why do we use one term to characterize all the meanings?

In summary, it is suggested that, although in using a new concept it is often necessary to explore in many directions with various methodologies, we might be at a point where a better convergence of research could be attained

by more systematic conceptualization of the concept of organizational climate, and by using the methodological strategies inherent in construct validation (Cronbach & Meehl, 1955). Litwin and Stringer (1968) have already provided an interesting example of this approach. They cogently argue that: "If the concept of organizational climate is to demonstrate real value in the understanding and explanation of behavior in organizations, it must be integrated with the kinds of theories of organizational behavior that have evolved and are in current use (p. 40)". Thus an essential starting point for the definition and assessment of organizational climate is the development of a theoretical network which specifies the properties of the organizational climate concept and which ties these properties causally to cognitions and behaviors of organization members. In view of the fact that VIE theory of motivation is a relatively explicitly stated theory of work motivation, it is suggested that it might provide an excellent vehicle which can be used to analyze the environmental conditions (both as perceived by organization members as well as conditions existing "in reality") which may be interdependent and interacting with motivational and goal setting variables.

For example, perceptions about the goal facilitating or blocking behaviors of supervisors and co-workers might affect instrumentality and expectancy perceptions (Hammer & Dachler, 1973). Similarly, Frederiksen's (1966) concept of a consistent climate may well be directly interpretable with the VIE theory framework. Perceptions about the reward orientation and the consistency with which the organization ties rewards to specific behavioral alternatives may have a bearing on the degree to which VIE perceptions relate to certain behaviors (Campbell & Beaty, 1971). Furthermore, it is possible to look at objective indices of the environment, such as size, number of organizational levels, existence of incentive plans, amount of training, frequency of changes in job assignments, and existence of multiple supervision, all of which might have a

bearing on the accuracy and realism with which organization members form beliefs about instrumentalities and expectancies, as well as on the realisticness of the goals employees may set for themselves.

In short, the framework of the VIE theory may allow the examination of a subset of the objective and subjective environment which has meaning through the hypothesized connection to the VIE theory constructs and which can be tested by systematically researching the arrays of hypotheses emerging from this theoretical network. Such an approach would not only provide some conceptual clarity to the concept of organizational climate, but might also provide some much needed answers to the question of the person - environment interaction as well as increase the conceptual clarity of the concept of motivation.

## References

- Andrews, J. D. W. The achievement motive and advancement in two types of organizations. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1967, 6, 163-169.
- Campbell, J. P., Dunnette, M. D., Lawler, E. E., & Weick, K. E. Managerial behavior, performance, and effectiveness. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1970.
- Campbell, J. P., & Beaty, E. E. Organizational climate: Its measurement and relationship to work group performance. Paper presented for symposium on organizational climate, G. A. Forehand chairman. 19th Annual Convention of the American Psychological Association, Washington, D.C., 1971.
- Cronbach, L. J., & Meehl, P. B. Construct validity in psychological tests. Psychological Bulletin, 1955, 52, 281-302.
- Dachler, H. P., & Mobley, W. H. Construct validation of an expectancy-instrumentality-task goal model of work motivation: Some theoretical boundary conditions. Journal of Applied Psychology, Monograph, 1973, 58, 397-418.
- Forehand, G. A. On the interaction of persons and organization. In R. Tagiuri and G. Litwin (Eds.). Organizational climate: Exploration of a concept.
- Forehand, G. A. & Gilmer, B. Environmental variation in studies of organizational behavior. Psychological Bulletin, 1964, 62, 361-382.
- Frederiksen, B. Some effects of organizational climates on administrative performance. Research Memorandum RM-66-21, Educational Testing Service, 1966.
- Friedlander, F. & Greenberg, S. Effect of job attitudes, training, and organizational climate on performance of the hard-core unemployed. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1971, 55, 287-295.

- Graen, G. B. Instrumentality theory of work motivation: Some experimental results and suggested modifications. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1969, 53 (2), 1-25.
- Guion, R. M. A note on organizational climate. Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 1973, 2, 120-125.
- Hammer, T. H. & Dachler, H. P. The process of supervision in the context of motivation theory. Working paper, University of Maryland, 1973.
- Hulin, C. L. Individual differences and job enrichment - the case against general treatments. In J. R. Maher (Ed.). New perspectives in job enrichment. New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold, 1971.
- Hulin, C. L. & Blood, M. R. Job enlargement, individual differences, and worker responses. Psychological Bulletin, 1968, 69, 41-55.
- Hyman, R. The nature of psychological inquiry. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1964.
- Lawler, E. E., III. Pay and organizational effectiveness: A psychological view. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1971.
- Lewin, K. The conceptual representation and the measurement of psychological forces. Durham, North Carolina: Duke University Press, 1938.
- Lewin, K. Field theory in social science. New York: Harper & Row, 1951.
- Lewin, K. R., Lippitt, R., & White, R. K. Patterns of aggressive behavior in experimentally created "social climates". Journal of Social Psychology, 1939, 10, 271-299.
- Lichtman, C. M. & Hunt, R. G. Personality and organization theory: A review of some conceptual literature. Psychological Bulletin, 1971, 76, 271-294.
- Litwin, G. H. & Stringer, R. A., Jr. Motivation and organizational climate. Boston: Harvard University Press, 1968.



- Locke, E. A. What is job satisfaction? Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 1969, 4, 309-336.
- March, J. G. & Simon, H. A. Organizations. New York: Wiley, 1958.
- Miner, J. B. & Dachler, H. P. Personnel attitudes and motivation. Annual Review of Psychology, 1973, 24, 379-402.
- Mitchell, T. R. & Biglan, A. Instrumentality theories: Current uses in psychology. Psychological Bulletin, 1971, 76, 432-454.
- Porter, L. W. & Lawler, E. E., III. Managerial attitudes and performance. Homewood, Ill.: Irwin-Dorsey, 1968.
- Pritchard, R. D. & Karasick, B. W. The effects of organizational climate on managerial job performance and job satisfaction. Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 1973, 9, 126-146.
- Schein, E. H. Organizational psychology. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1965.
- Schneider, B. The perceived environment: Organizational climate. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Midwestern Psychological Association, Chicago, 1973.
- Schneider, B. & Bartlett, C. J. Individual differences and organizational climate, I: The research plan and questionnaire development. Personnel Psychology, 1968, 21, 323-333.
- Strauss, G. Some notes on power-equalization. In H. J. Leavitt (Eds.). The social science of organizations. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1963.
- Tagiuri, R. The concept of organizational climate. In R. Tagiuri and G. Litwin (Eds.). Organizational climate: Exploration of a concept. Boston: Harvard University Press, 1968, pp. 9-32.
- Vroom, V. H. Work and motivation. New York: Wiley, 1964.

## DISTRIBUTION LIST

### Navy

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| <p>4 Dr. Marshall J. Farr, Director<br/>Personnel &amp; Training Research Programs<br/>Office of Naval Research<br/>Arlington, VA 22217</p> <p>1 Director<br/>ONR Branch Office<br/>495 Summer Street<br/>Boston, MA 02210</p> <p>1 Director<br/>ONR Branch Office<br/>1030 East Green Street<br/>Pasadena, CA 91101<br/>ATTN: E. E. Gloye</p> <p>1 Director<br/>ONR Branch Office<br/>536 South Clark Street<br/>Chicago, IL 60605<br/>ATTN: M. A. Bertin</p> <p>6 Director<br/>Naval Research Laboratory<br/>Code 2627<br/>Washington, DC 20390</p> <p>12 Defense Documentation Center<br/>Cameron Station, Building 5<br/>5010 Duke Street<br/>Alexandria, VA 22314</p> <p>1 Chairman<br/>Behavioral Science Department<br/>Naval Command &amp; Management Division<br/>U.S. Naval Academy<br/>Luce Hall<br/>Annapolis, MD 21402</p> <p>1 Chief of Naval Technical Training<br/>Naval Air Station Memphis (75)<br/>Millington, TN 38054<br/>ATTN: Dr. N. J. Kerr</p> <p>1 Chief of Naval Training<br/>Naval Air Station<br/>Pensacola, FL 32508<br/>ATTN: CAPT Bruce Stone, USN</p> | <p>1 LCDR Charles J. Theisen, Jr., MSC, USN<br/>4024<br/>Naval Air Development Center<br/>Warminster, PA 18974</p> <p>1 Mr. Lee Miller (AIR 413E)<br/>Naval Air Systems Command<br/>5600 Columbia Pike<br/>Falls Church, VA 22042</p> <p>1 Special Assistant for Manpower<br/>OASN (M&amp;RA)<br/>The Pentagon, Room 4E794<br/>Washington, DC 20350</p> <p>1 Dr. Richard J. Niehaus<br/>Office of Civilian Manpower Management<br/>Code 06A<br/>Department of the Navy<br/>Washington, DC 20390</p> <p>1 CDR Richard L. Martin, USN<br/>COMFAIRMIRAMAR F-14<br/>NAS Miramar, CA 92145</p> <p>1 Commanding Officer<br/>Naval Medical Neuropsychiatric<br/>Research Unit<br/>San Diego, CA 92152</p> <p>1 Technical Reference Library<br/>Naval Medical Research Institute<br/>National Naval Medical Center<br/>Bethesda, MD 20014</p> <p>1 Chief<br/>Bureau of Medicine and Surgery<br/>Research Division (Code 713)<br/>Department of the Navy<br/>Washington, DC 20372</p> <p>1 Dr. John J. Collins<br/>Chief of Naval Operations (OP-987F)<br/>Department of the Navy<br/>Washington, DC 20350</p> <p>1 Technical Library<br/>Bureau of Naval Personnel<br/>Department of the Navy<br/>Washington, DC 20360</p> |
|--|--|

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| <p>1 Head, Personnel Measurement Staff<br/>Capital Area Personnel Office<br/>Ballston Tower #2, Room 1204<br/>801 N. Randolph Street<br/>Arlington, VA 22203</p> <p>10 Dr. James J. Regan, Technical Director<br/>Naval Personnel Research and<br/>Development Center<br/>San Diego, CA 92152</p> <p>1 Superintendent<br/>Naval Postgraduate School<br/>Monterey, CA 92940<br/>ATTN: Library (Code 2124)</p> <p>1 Technical Library<br/>Naval Ship Systems Command<br/>National Center, Building 3<br/>Room 3S08<br/>Washington, DC 20360</p> <p>1 Chief of Naval Training Support<br/>Code N-21<br/>Building 45<br/>Naval Air Station<br/>Pensacola, FL 32508</p> <p>1 Dr. William L. Maloy<br/>Principal Civilian Advisor for<br/>Education and Training<br/>Naval Training Command, Code 01A<br/>Pensacola, FL 32508</p> <p>1 Dr. Hanss H. Wolff<br/>Technical Director (Code N-2)<br/>Naval Training Equipment Center<br/>Orlando, FL 32813</p> <p>1 CDR Fred Richardson<br/>Naval Recruiting Command<br/>BCT #9, Room 215<br/>Washington, DC 20370</p> <p>1 Mr. Arnold Rubinstein<br/>Naval Material Command (NMAT-03424)<br/>Room 820, Crystal Plaza #6<br/>Washington, DC 20360</p> <p>1 Director, Navy Occupational Task<br/>Analysis Program (NOTAP)<br/>Navy Personnel Program Support Activity<br/>Building 1304, Bolling AFB<br/>Washington, DC 20336</p> | <p><u>Army</u></p> <p>1 Commandant<br/>U.S. Army Institute of Administration<br/>ATTN: EA<br/>Fort Benjamin Harrison, IN 46216</p> <p>1 Armed Forces Staff College<br/>Norfolk, VA 23511<br/>ATTN: Library</p> <p>1 Director of Research<br/>U.S. Army Armor Human Research Unit<br/>ATTN: Library<br/>Building 2422 Murade Street<br/>Fort Knox, KY 40121</p> <p>1 Dr. J. E. Uhlener, Technical Director<br/>U.S. Army Research Institute for the<br/>Behavioral &amp; Social Sciences<br/>1300 Wilson Boulevard<br/>Arlington, VA 22209</p> <p>1 Commanding Officer<br/>ATTN: LTC Montgomery<br/>USACDC - PASA<br/>Ft. Benjamin Harrison, IN 46249</p> <p>1 Commandant<br/>United States Army Infantry School<br/>ATTN: ATSIN-H<br/>Fort Benning, GA 31905</p> <p>1 U.S. Army Research Institute<br/>Commonwealth Building, Room 239<br/>1300 Wilson Boulevard<br/>Arlington, VA 22209<br/>ATTN: Dr. R. Dusek</p> <p>1 Mr. Edmund F. Fuchs<br/>U.S. Army Research Institute<br/>1300 Wilson Boulevard<br/>Arlington, VA 22209</p> <p>1 Commander<br/>U.S. Theater Army Support Command,<br/>Europe<br/>ATTN: Asst. DCSPER (Education)<br/>APO New York 09058</p> <p>1 Dr. Stanley L. Cohen<br/>Work Unit Area Leader<br/>Organizational Development Work Unit<br/>Army Research Institute for Behavioral<br/>and Social Science<br/>1300 Wilson Boulevard<br/>Arlington, VA 22209</p> |
|---|---|

### Air Force

- 1 Headquarters, U.S. Air Force  
Chief, Personnel Research & Analysis  
Division (AF/DPSY)  
Washington, DC 20330
- 1 Research and Analysis Division  
AF/DPXYR Room 4C200  
Washington, DC 20330
- 1 AFHRL/MD  
701 Prince Street  
Room 200  
Alexandria, VA 22314
- 1 Personnel Research Division  
AFHRL  
Lackland Air Force Base  
Texas 78236
- 1 AFOSR(NL)  
1400 Wilson Boulevard  
Arlington, VA 22209
- 1 CAPT Jack Thorpe, USAF  
Department of Psychology  
Bowling Green State University  
Bowling Green, OH 43403
- 1 Lt. Col. Henry L. Taylor, USAF  
Military Assistant for Human Resources  
OAD(E&LS) ODDR&E  
Pentagon, Room 3D129  
Washington, DC 20301

### Marine Corps

- 1 COL George Caridakis  
Director, Office of Manpower Utilization  
Headquarters, Marine Corps (AOIH)  
MCB  
Quantico, VA 22134
- 1 Dr. A. L. Slafkosky  
Scientific Advisor (Code Ax)  
Commandant of the Marine Corps  
Washington, DC 20380
- 1 Mr. E. A. Dover  
Manpower Measurement Unit (Code MPT)  
Arlington Annex, Room 2413  
Arlington, VA 20370

### Coast Guard

- 1 Mr. Joseph J. Cowan, Chief  
Psychological Research Branch (P-1)  
U.S. Coast Guard Headquarters  
400 Seventh Street, S.W.  
Washington, DC 20590

### Other DOD

- 1 Lt. Col. Austin W. Kibler, Director  
Human Resources Research Office  
Advanced Research Projects Agency  
1400 Wilson Boulevard  
Arlington, VA 22209

### Other Government

- 1 Dr. Lorraine D. Eyde  
Personnel Research & Development Center  
U.S. Civil Service Commission, Room 3458  
1900 E Street, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20415
- 1 Dr. Vern Urry  
Personnel Research & Development Center  
U.S. Civil Service Commission  
1900 E Street, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20415

### Miscellaneous

- 1 Dr. Scarvia B. Anderson  
Educational Testing Service  
17 Executive Park Drive, N.E.  
Atlanta, GA 30329
- 1 Dr. Richard C. Atkinson  
Stanford University  
Department of Psychology  
Stanford, CA 94305
- 1 Dr. Bernard M. Bass  
University of Rochester  
Management Research Center  
Rochester, NY 14627
- 1 Century Research Corporation  
4113 Lee Highway  
Arlington, VA 22207

- 1 Dr. Gerald Barrett  
University of Akron  
Department of Psychology  
Akron, OH 44325
- 1 Dr. Kenneth E. Clark  
University of Rochester  
College of Arts and Sciences  
River Campus Station  
Rochester, NY 14627
- 1 Dr. Rene V. Dawis  
University of Minnesota  
Department of Psychology  
Minneapolis, MN 55455
- 1 Dr. Robert Dubin  
University of California  
Graduate School of Administration  
Irvine, CA 92664
- 1 Dr. Marvin D. Dunnette  
University of Minnesota  
Department of Psychology  
N492 Elliott Hall  
Minneapolis, MN 55455
- 2 ERIC  
Processing and Reference Facility  
4833 Rugby Avenue  
Bethesda, MD 20014
- 1 Dr. Victor Fields  
Department of Psychology  
Montgomery College  
Rockville, MD 20850
- 1 Dr. Edwin A. Fleishman  
American Institutes for Research  
8555 Sixteenth Street  
Silver Spring, MD 20910
- 1 Dr. Richard S. Hatch  
Decision Systems Associates, Inc.  
11428 Rockville Pike  
Rockville, MD 20852
- 1 Dr. M. D. Havron  
Human Sciences Research, Inc.  
Westgate Industrial Park  
7710 Old Springhouse Road  
McLean, VA 22101
- 1 Human Resources Research Organization  
Division #3  
P.O. Box 5787  
Presidio of Monterey, CA 93940
- 1 Human Resources Research Organization  
Division #4, Infantry  
P.O. Box 2086  
Fort Benning, GA 31905
- 1 Human Resources Research Organization  
Division #5, Air Defense  
P.O. Box 6057  
Fort Bliss, TX 79916
- 1 Human Resources Research Organization  
Division #6, Library  
P.O. Box 428  
Fort Rucker, AL 36360
- 1 Dr. Lawrence B. Johnson  
Lawrence Johnson & Associates, Inc.  
200 S Street, N.W. Suite 502  
Washington, DC 20009
- 1 Dr. E. J. McCormick  
Purdue University  
Department of Psychological Sciences  
Lafayette, IN 47907
- 1 Dr. Robert R. Mackie  
Human Factors Research, Inc.  
6780 Cortona Drive  
Santa Barbara Research Park  
Goleta, CA 93017
- 1 Mr. Edmond Marks  
109 Grange Building  
Pennsylvania State University  
University Park, PA 16802
- 1 Dr. Leo Munday  
Vice President  
American College Testing Program  
P.O. Box 168  
Iowa City, IA 52240
- 1 Mr. Luigi Petrullo  
2431 North Edgewood Street  
Arlington, VA 22207

- 1 Dr. Joseph W. Rigney  
Behavioral Technology Laboratories  
University of Southern California  
3717 South Grand  
Los Angeles, CA 90007
- 1 Dr. Leonard L. Rosenbaum, Chairman  
Department of Psychology  
Montgomery College  
Rockville, MD 20850
- 1 Dr. Arthur I. Siegel  
Applied Psychological Services  
Science Center  
404 East Lancaster Avenue  
Wayne, PA 19087
- 1 Dr. David J. Weiss  
University of Minnesota  
Department of Psychology  
Minneapolis, MN 55455
- 1 Dr. Anita West  
Denver Research Institute  
University of Denver  
Denver, CO 80210
- 1 Dr. Alfred F. Smode, Staff Consultant  
Training Analysis and Evaluation Group  
Naval Training Equipment Center  
Code N-00T  
Orlando, FL 32813